DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 472 CS 505 241

AUTHOR Rubin, Rebecca B.; Feezel, Jerry D.
TITLE Elements of Teacher Communication Competence: An Examination of Skills, Knowledge and Motivation to Communicate.
PUB DATE 3 Nov 84
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Higher Education; *Knowledge Level; Preservice Teacher Education; *Speech Communication; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Motivation; *Teaching Skills; Test Use

ABSTRACT

In an effort to assess the communication skills of prospective teachers, a study examined the role of three pedagogical domains in speech communication instruction--skill, knowledge, and motivation. Fifty student teachers were tested using the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PCRA; McCroskey 1977), the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI), and the Snyder Speech Scale (SSS). Additional indications of skill level were taken from student records. The results of analyses showed that motivation for communication was not a differentiating factor in the success of student teachers, and that the student teacher's knowledge of content and teaching appears to be only slightly related to overall teaching assessment. The study concluded that the SSS, with its focus on public speaking skills, might be a useful device to use in methods courses or seminars to examine lecturing skills prior student teaching. However, the CCAI, with its focus on interpersonal and listening skills, may reflect both skill and knowledge and might be more appropriate for use in a prospective teacher's college career to help identify weak areas for extra training. Likewise, the PRCA may indicate students who might benefit from instruction aimed at alleviating anxiety. (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED267472

ELEMENTS OF TEACHER COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE:

AN EXAMINATION OF SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE AND MOTIVATION TO COMMUNICATE

Rebecca B. Rubin & Jerry D. Feezel

Associate Professor Associate Professor

School of Speech Communication

Kent State University

Kent, Ohio 44242

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Speech Communication Association
Chicago, Illinois
November 3, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerry D. Feezel

Rebecca B. Rubin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 241

ELEMENTS OF TEACHER COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE:

AN EXAMINATION OF SKILLS, KNOWLEDGE AND MOTIVATION TO COMMUNICATE

Teachers, as facilitators of learning, spend much of their time in communication activities. They speak and lecture to classes, they listen to students and colleagues, and they interact interpersonally with not only students and colleagues, but with parents, administrators, and the public. Thus, impressions of teachers' communication competence are largely predicated on their oral communication skills.

Most of the instruction in oral communication that teachers receive is at the college level. In fact, most colleges that train teachers for state certification require, at minimum, a basic college course in speech communication. Sometimes speaking and listening skills are further emphasized in teaching methods courses taught by education or content-specialization faculty. However, it is not yet a common practice to actually assess prospective teachers' communication skills in college. Since many college students student-teach during their senior years in college, problems that are noted at that late date often go uncorrected.

Skill, of course, is only one of three pedagogical domains in speech communication instruction. The other two, knowledge and motivation, are essential to the communication process, but are not as easy to assess as is the skill component. In order to fully understand these three domains and how they relate to each other, it is necessary to elaborate on the theoretical basis of this tripartite model.

Motivation appears to be the foundation of effective teaching. If teachers' attitudes, values, and desires to teach are negative, perhaps they should not enter the teaching profession. Vital to determination of a career choice, then, is knowledge of one's self and one's abilities and inclinations,

professionally. A further aspect of motivation relates to the desire to speak and/or listen to others. Those individuals lacking this motivation are often termed apprehensive or anxious. One can only hope that college students who lack this motivation will be discouraged from continuing their progress towards teaching certification or will receive help in alleviating this anxiety.

Knowledge of one's self as a prospective teacher and the roles one will need to take in this profession is also a matter of self-awareness or introspection. Education and content methods courses often teach and test students' knowledge of these roles and of the teaching process. Knowledge of appropriate behavior in classroom settings, likewise, is taught in methods courses and exhibited in student-teaching environments. Prospective teachers' knowledge of their content areas is assessed in each and every class that they take in college through exams, papers, reports, etc. However, knowledge of what constitutes effective communication is often ignored; many feel that skill demonstration automatically means that students know why they are performing as they do. One recent study has found that this relationship is not as strong as we might expect (Rubin, 1984); students may evidence effective skills without awareness or understanding of principles involved.

Skill, or performance, is, of course, an essential ingredient in the pedagogical domain. Abilities to carry on effective interpersonal relationships with others, to speak clearly and concisely, to lead and interact in group environments, and to listen with understanding and empathy are most important for all teachers. The indirect methods of assessing these skills that are currently used in student-teaching evaluations, however, are sometimes unreliable and invalid. What seems to be necessary is a method of accurately assessing students' communication skills, along with their

underlying motivations and knowledge, so that deficiencies are not discovered just prior to graduation.

The goal of the present investigation is to examine more fully the role of these three pedagogical domains in successful student-teaching. In order to discover the relationships among these domains, we will examine the motivation, knowledge and skill of students immediately prior to their student teaching experience in relation to their evaluations at the end of student teaching to see what factors might be related to successful student-teaching. First, however, we will look at methods of evaluating motivation, knowledge and skill in relation to communication performance in a teaching context.

Motivation Assessment

Numerous instruments have been developed and used over the past 40 years to gauge speech fear, anxiety, avoidance, shyness, and unwillingness to communicate in formal interpersonal and large group settings (Foss, 1983; Backlund, 1983). Some of these instruments have been used successfully in the educational context where the focus is on the teacher's apprehension, not the student's. For instance, McCroskey, Andersen, Richmond, and Wheeless (1981) found that teachers preferring to teach grades K-4 were higher in communication apprehension than those who preferred teaching higher grades.

Yet it is still not clear whether these techniques are measuring apprehension in particular settings (state approach) or a general apprehension to communicate (trait approach). This issue has been raised with many self-report scales. In particular, the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) (McCroskey, 1977) is offered as a measure of trait-like apprehension that is seen as relatively enduring, and existing in a variety of contexts. Research has suggested that self-report measures reflect only situationally-based reactions or temporary states of the individual. For instance, Kearney and McCroskey (1980) found an interaction between

perceptions of teachers (as evidenced in the teacher communication style measure) and state communication apprehension levels. However, Staton-Spicer (1983) found that teacher communication concern, which is comprised of self, task and impact dimensions, was unrelated to anxiety but correlated with attitudes towards teaching. This research pointed to future needs of assessing both communication concern and communication apprehension to help teachers understand potential classroom problems they might have.

These methods of assessing motivation to communicate, however, pose potential limitations for their use in teacher education programs. First, the commonly used self-report method is probably the least reliable type of assessment. Many of these personal inventories are affected by social desirability response sets; implicit needs to project a positive image may lead to reporting feelings or attitudes which are socially desired. Second, there is the possibility of confusing ideal self-images with actual ones. Such distortions in self-reports are often not intentionally deceitful, but students may not be sufficiently self-aware to distinguish their real, current traits from their desired or hoped for ones. Third, these methods are often not specifically geared to the teaching context. It is most important that apprehension that some teachers experience in the classroom be examined as opposed to apprehension experienced in non-specific public speaking or group communication situations. Physiological measures of apprehension, while more directly connected to expressed apprehension, pose their own set of measurement problems.

Thus, for this investigation, a self-report measure of communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1978) was adapted to the teaching context. Thirteen of the original 25 PRCA questions were changed slightly (e.g., "classroom" replaced the word "audience," "teachers" or "students" replaced "people,"

"lecture" replaced "speech," "teaching" replaced "communicating" and "speaking," etc.) to make this measure of motivation to communicate more specific to the teaching context. In addition, the Staton-Spicer (1983) measure of communication concern was employed to assess what, in particular, was of most concern to students as they are about to embark on their student-teaching experience.

Knowledge Assessment

The knowledge of teaching content and process may be viewed as a second stage in the development of teachers. A full understanding of the subjects to be taught as well as principles of learning and methods of instruction are both important precursors of refined skill in educating. One false dichotomy in the knowledge domain is the debate on content vs. process of teaching. The overused question, "Do you teach math (history, reading, art, etc.) or do you teach kids?" raises misleading assessment issues. In fact, one does both; knowing WHAT and HOW to educate are equally important and one without the other leads to ineffective education.

A recent report (Boyer, 1984) emphasizes the need for both knowledge and skill in teaching. Knowledge was defined as an understanding of the curriculum (subject matter and how knowledge of it is assessed), of the student, and of the classroom and school setting. Most commonly, assessment of the many knowledge areas is obtained through formal course assignments over a student's entire college program. The typical method of assessment is expert (instructor) ratings of the student's written work on exams, papers, and reports. Oral reports or presentations may be used as well, but even here the focus of evaluation is not so much on the actual pedagogical communication skills demonstrated as on the underlying understandings communicated. In other words, assessments of student understanding of content and process of

teaching is predominately a cognitive-oriented rating by instructors via formal objectives and essay assignments.

In the present investigation, we attempt to tap this sort of knowledge through examination of students' grade point averages, both in professional education courses and in content areas. We realize the potential danger in using these measures, but no other measure of knowledge was available.

Teaching Skill Assessment

Pedagogical skills are traditionally assessed in a variety of ways. Self-evaluation methods include self-reports, self-study materials, self-rating forms, observation of colleagues' teaching, and the use of audio or videotape for evaluation and feedback (Carroll, 1981). These self-evaluation methods are often helpful in discovering teaching strengths and weaknesses, but are not frequently used prior to teaching methods courses.

Proficiency exams are also used to assess skills. However, as Pottinger (1979, p. 30) notes, "Proficiency examinations are intended to demonstrate job related abilities rather than academic skills (the latter being assessed by equivalency tests)." These job-related abilities, not assessable when students are not actually employed by a school system, are usually assessed through the use of a teacher certification examination where actual teaching performance is not observed. For the communication skills of speaking and listening, it is vital that performance be observed.

However, a more prominent method of skills assessment is the use of a superior (e.g., a supervising teacher) to evaluate classroom behavior on various dimensions. Usually the rating forms used for such an assessment reflect the characteristics of teaching that are believed to be most effective in motivating learning. Hattie, Olphert and Cole (1982) found two main factors that supervising teachers use when rating student-teachers--preparation and presentation. The variables that loaded highly on the

preparation factor were: preparation of lessons, objectives, content, development and class management. These skills are typically taught in content-area methods courses. Presentation variables included: strategies and aids; voice, speech, language competence; introduction; conclusion; varying the presentation; exposition; using examples; questioning; demonstrating; encouragement of students' questions; discussion; listening encouragement of student activity; and flexibility. These communication skills are not always taught but are often assessed during student-teaching.

Not all cooperating teachers use the same criteria, however. This lack of agreement has led Natriello and Dornbusch (1980-81, p. 4) to suggest: "Administrators should devise systems for the evaluation of teachers in which the procedures are sufficiently specific to result in general agreement among different evaluations. This may be accomplished by clarifying task allocations and the criteria used for assessing performance."

In this study, teaching evaluation is measured through use of the Teaching Behavior Checklist used by cooperating teachers and methods course instructors for evaluating preservice teachers. To provide an additional measure of credibility of the student-teacher, McCroskey, Holdridge and Toomb's (1974) teacher credibility scale was completed by cooperating teachers for their student-teachers. This instrument consists of 14 semantic differential scales representing five dimensions: character, sociability, composure, extroversion, and competence. These researchers found that the competence dimension was an adequate predictor of learning while the competence and sociability dimensions predicted the recommendation of a course to others.

Communication Skill Assessment

Many states require prospective student-teachers to demonstrate

proficiency in speech communication skills (McCaleb, forthcoming). All too often this demonstration takes the form of a basic required course or a speech proficiency test comprised of articulation drills. As we have seen, teachers need a variety of speech communication skills, but few instruments tap this extensive a variety.

In response to this need for an assessment instrument that addresses a variety of college-level communication skills, the Speech Communication Association has published the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument (CCAI) (Rubin, 1982b). This instrument, designed to tap the skill levels of college students in the areas of speaking, listening, and human relations, was based on an expert-derived list of competencies that all students should possess in order to interact with professors and peers and in classroom settings in college (Rubin, 1982a). The list of competencies assessed by the CCAI closely resembles lists that are generated for teachers. In effect, the competencies addressed are those necessary in an educational context.

The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument taps students' skill levels in nineteen different areas:

Listen effectively to spoken English
Use words, pronunciation and grammar appropriate for the situation
Use nonverbal signs appropriate for the situation
Use voice effectively
Identify main ideas in messages
Distinguish facts from opinions
Distinguish between informative and persuasive messages
Recognize when another does not understand your message
Express ideas clearly and concisely
Express and defend with evidence your point of view
Organize (order) messages so that others can understand them
Ask questions to obtain information
Answer questions effectively
Give concise and accurate directions
Summarize messages
Describe another's viewpoint
Describe differences in opinion
Express feelings to others
Perform social rituals

The format for the assessment utilizes a rating of students' actual speaking behavior and an interview setting. Students do not communicate through writing, nor does the ability to read interfere with this assessment of speaking and listening skills. Five skill levels are identified for each of the 19 assessed competencies, ranging from a rating of "5" (indicating superior skill demonstration) to a rating of "1" (indicating that the student is clearly deficient in that particular skill area). Skill levels for each of the 19 assessments are totalled for a combined speaking and listening (communication) score.

Another instrument that taps speaking skills is the Snyder Speech Scale (SSS) (Snyder, 1980). This instrument emphasizes public speaking skills and applies them to the educational context. Students prepare a five-minute speech that is rated on six factors: organization and development, adaptation to the audience, language usage, ability to motivate the audience, delivery, and overall impression. Each category is weighted according to the relative importance that Snyder inferred from the literature. McCaleb (1983) used both the CCAI and the SSS with a group of preservice teachers and found that the CCAI demonstrated 88% accuracy in predicting preservice teacher's performance ratings while the accuracy for the SSS was 67%. In addition, the SSS was more accurate in predicting those rated below average and the CCAI was better for predicting those at or above average on performance measures. McCaleb suggested that the CCAI would be more beneficial for use early in the educational career of a student since it was developed around the concept of minimal competence and not above-average competence that should be present in the communication of students about to embark in student-teaching. At that point in time, students' communication skills can be assessed and necessary instructional intervention can occur before deficiencies in communication show up in actual teaching situations.

Students anticipating a career in teaching progress, developmentally, through three distinct dimensions of communicative competence. Motivation to communicate is most basic to this process. Students must be free from communication apprehension, especially the form that is debilitating in a teaching context. Next, students must gain knowledge of roles assumed by teachers as well as an understanding of the content material that they will be teaching. Finally, students must develop communication skills so that they can clearly and effectively relate this knowledge to others. The study described here attempted to test this tripartite model.

Method

Fifty student volunteers whose names were drawn randomly from student-teaching seminars at Kent State University during the Fall of 1983 participated as subjects in this study. At Kent State, student-teachers either receive instruction in content methods for the first six weeks of the semester and then student-teach in area school systems for 10 weeks, or they student-teach in two different sites for eight weeks each. Most (N=43) subjects were on the six/ten week plan, so the study was conducted at the beginning of their student-teaching.

Communication Skill Assessment.

During the fifth and sixth weeks of the semester, subjects came to the Communication Research Center (CRC) for skill testing at pre-scheduled times. At the CRC, subjects' communication performance skills were rated by two evaluators. During the evaluation of the speech portion of the CCAI, both the CCAI rating sheet and the SSS were used to evaluate communication skills. It should be noted that the recommended SSS procedure allows for prior preparation in contrast to the extemporaneous nature of the speech in the CCAI. To control for the unevenness for time devoted to prior preparation,

the CCAI procedure of limiting preparation time was employed. As additional indications of skill level, the following were gleaned from student records: the number of communication skill courses subjects had taken, their average grade in communication skill courses, and their grade in the basic skill course.

Communication Motivation Assessment.

Half the group received a questionnaire prior to skill assessment and half completed the questionnaire after skill assessment. The questionnaire consisted of a revised version of the 25-item PRCA (McCroskey, 1978) that was described earlier in this paper and the Communication Concern questionnaire (Staton-Spicer, 1983). At the end of the semester, students were mailed the Communication Concern Questionnaire and asked, once again, to complete it and return it to the investigators. All students complied.

Academic Knowledge Assessment.

At the communication skill assessment session, students gave their permission for examination of their academic files and their student-teaching evaluation forms. From their academic files, three indications of knowledge were extracted: Professional Education GPA, Content Specialty GPA, and Overall GPA.

Teaching Skill Assessment.

The student-teaching evaluation form, completed by a student-teacher's cooperating teacher (the teacher in the schools) in conference with the University supervisor in content area and level, is composed of 17 items relating to four teaching roles: Decision Maker (knows how to plan instruction, seeks information about student needs, well organized, understands how to get special help for students), Instructor (uses appropriate instructional approaches to teaching, takes individual/cultural

differences into consideration, and analyzes/evaluates own performance), Interactor (transmits enthusiasm for learning, communicates effectively, fosters positive self-concepts, involves learners in lessons, facilitates positive classroom interaction, and assumes a professional role), and Scholar (demonstrates grasp of subject matter, is an "educated person", has a broad base of professional knowledge, and demonstrates a commitment to professional growth).

In addition, classroom cooperating teachers were contacted by mail and asked to complete the Teacher Credibility Questionnaire (McCroskey, Holdridge & Toomb, 1974). Ninety-four percent (N=47) of the cooperating teachers returned completed questionnaires.

Results and Discussion

Several statistical analyses were conducted on the data. The primary method of analysis was the inter-correlation of all measures. Pearson product-moment correlation are found in Table 1. Other analyses were used, as well, to highlight relationships among variables.

Analysis of demographic information revealed that 96% of the subjects were non-minority individuals. The sample consisted of 36 females and 14 males. Subjects ranged in age from 21 to 50 years. The mean age of the sample was 26.44 years while the mode (N=16) was 22. Eight percent of the sample were in early childhood education, forty percent were concentrating on elementary and special education, and 52% were at the secondary level. Subjects concentrating on secondary education represented the content fields of art (7), communications (2), English (2), home economics (4), mathematics (1), music (5), physical education (4), and social studies (1).

Motivation

Generally, the motivational indicators of the revised PRCA and Teacher Communication Concern were unrelated to other factors in the study. The

revised PRCA did show a moderate inverse relationship ($r = -.40$) with the extroversion subscale of Teacher Credibility. Those student-teachers with higher apprehension were judged as less extroverted by their cooperating teachers. This was as expected from previous research on the PRCA and Teacher Credibility; but a positive relationship between the PRCA and the composure subscale of teacher credibility was not found in these data. Contrary to previous research (McCroskey, et al, 1981), early childhood and elementary student-teachers did not seem more apprehensive of communicating than those at the secondary level ($F(1,48) = 0.04$, $p = .85$).

Thus, it seems that motivation for teacher communication, as measured herein, was not a differentiating factor in the success of student-teachers. As previously mentioned, it may be that those who were high apprehensives had already exited the teaching program or may have received effective help in reducing their apprehension. However, it also may be that only those student-teachers without high apprehension voluntarily participated after random selection. In fact, at least six student-teachers failed to arrive for their appointments; one even explained that she was too apprehensive to speak in front of persons her age or older. Both of the above possible interpretations are supported by the fact that the overall PRCA mean and median were 63 (compared with means in the seventies in prior studies). Also, the scores ranged from 44 to 88 (88 is generally conceived of as the low end of high apprehension). Thus, these scores are well below those found for a general population using the 25-item form. It may be, also, that the revisions made to the PRCA turned the instrument into a state measure where student-teachers would not be expected to score in the higher range.

Knowledge

The student-teacher's knowledge of content and teaching appears to be only slightly related to overall teaching assessment; only a few significant but low correlations occurred between the various GPA's and either teacher credibility and teacher evaluations by supervisors. For example, overall GPA correlated with the extroversion component of the Teacher Credibility Scale at -.26 ($p < .05$). The Major GPA correlated with only one element of Teacher Credibility--character (-.35, $p < .05$). All other correlations were non-significant. An interesting finding was that most of the knowledge measures (GPA's) were negatively related to the teacher credibility dimensions (even though most correlations were not statistically significant). Thus, there appears to be little connection between GPA and teacher credibility.

The Professional Education GPA correlated with the overall teaching evaluation at .25 ($p < .05$) and with the decision-making component of this evaluation at .27 ($p < .05$). No further significant relationships were found between teaching evaluation and knowledge indices.

Examination of the relationship between knowledge and skill reveals that the average speech grade was moderately correlated with both the overall GPA ($r = .38$, $p < .05$) and the professional GPA ($r = .41$, $p < .05$) and was highly related to the major GPA ($r = .80$, $p < .01$). This last relationship, however, reflects only about half of the total sample since only secondary-level teachers had a major GPA. The other inter-correlations are understandable since the grades received in the speech courses would actually reflect both skills and knowledge. In addition, it is plausible that those who have high grade point averages would likely receive higher grades in a speech course, as well.

Skills

The most interesting results of this study center on the relationships between the measures of communication skills and the other factors. With respect to the CCAI, the total score was moderately related to the student's grade in the basic speech skills course ($r = .39$, $p < .05$), but the SSS was not significantly related to any speech grade or to the number of speech courses taken in the past. The CCAI speech subscale (alpha = .74), composed of the first six items on the CCAI, also related moderately to speech grades ($r = .37$, $p < .05$ for the average speech grade, and $r = .44$, $p < .05$ for basic course grade). The CCAI and the SSS were moderately inter-correlated, as well ($r = .44$, $p < .001$), and the SSS subscales of organization/development ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) and audience motivation ($r = .55$, $p < .001$) most strongly associated with the CCAI. It appears that the several measures of communication skills used in this study are related though they may have differing points of focus or emphasis. The SSS clearly focuses on public speaking skills, while the CCAI includes classroom management, listening and interpersonal items as well.

As seen in Table 1, both the CCAI and the SSS seem to be associated with supervisor-assessed student-teaching success. The SSS was moderately related to most areas of teacher credibility and the overall total ($r = .38$, $p < .01$), whereas the CCAI was related to the competence ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), character ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), and sociability ($r = .24$, $p < .05$) subscales of credibility. Similarly, the SSS was moderately related to the supervisor evaluation of student-teaching ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and all four subscales ($r = .29$ to $.48$), whereas the CCAI was only moderately related to the Interaction subscale ($r = .31$, $p < .05$) of teaching evaluation. When ANOVA was used, having divided the teaching evaluations into groups of students by thirds, the lowest third of the evaluations differed significantly from the

other two groups on the SSS measure ($F(2,44) = 4.81$, $p = .01$) and on the total Credibility scale ($F(2,41) = 9.87$, $p < .001$) but no differences were found between these three groups on the CCAI scores ($F(2,44) = 2.15$, $p = .13$).

The teaching evaluation form, as evidenced by the dimensions described above, did not deal specifically with components of communication, but many items seemed to be related. Thus, the lack of strong correlations between the SSS and CCAI and the teaching evaluation scales were not surprising. One item in the teaching evaluation scale did deal expressly with communication--"The student-teacher communicates effectively with learners." This item correlated moderately with the CCAI ($r = .37$, $p < .01$), the SSS ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), the total credibility score ($r = .33$, $p < .05$), the competence component of credibility ($r = .44$, $p = .001$), and the sociability component of credibility ($r = .33$, $p < .05$). The two assessments of teaching (credibility and student-teaching final evaluation) were also clearly interrelated ($r = .55$, $p < .001$). This suggested reliability of assessment since both of these scales were completed by the same cooperating teacher on separate occasions within a four to five week period with the University supervisor collaborating on the teaching evaluation.

One final comparison must be made. The CCAI and the SSS were both proposed as means of evaluating communication skills of prospective teachers. Examination of Table 1 and the results presented above indicates that the SSS seems to be more strongly related to measures of student-teaching effectiveness. One reason for this may be that the SSS focuses solely on public speaking skills in contrast to the interpersonal and listening skills contained in the CCAI. For example, a student-teacher could have superior public speaking skills, but poor listening or interpersonal skills and therefore receive an average CCAI score. But with the SSS, the student-

teacher would appear above average. The teaching evaluation scale has only a global communication item, and the CCAI and SSS are correlated at about the same level with that one item.

In addition, due the make-up of the SSS instrument with weights applied to subscales, the range of scores was potentially much larger than with the CCAI. For our sample, the CCAI ranged only from 56 to 86 with a variance of 50. However the SSS scores ranged from 26 to 97, with a variance of 218, showing a much greater variability in total scores. Thus, the SSS has more potential for discriminating among these subjects. The CCAI, developed as a measure of college-level communication skill, demonstrated more variability with a mixed population of students (Rubin, 1982a). In the 1982 study, the mean score was 63, while the student-teachers in the present investigation appeared to have a much higher level of skill ($\underline{M}$ = 70.44). McCaleb (1983), indeed, suggested that the CCAI would be potentially more beneficial if used early in a student's college career since it was developed on a minimal competence concept.

We conclude, therefore, that the SSS might be a useful devise to use in methods courses/seminars to examine lecturing skills prior to student-teaching. This would allow students to refine their presentational skills. The CCAI, however, may be more appropriate for use early in a prospective teacher's college career. Since it seems to associate more closely with what is graded in a basic speech course, the CCAI may reflect both skill and knowledge, while the SSS is more presentational skills-oriented. The CCAI, in dealing with speaking, listening, interpersonal and classroom management skills, would help identify areas of weakness at a point when extra training might be possible (instead of during a student's senior year). Likewise, the PRCA, also administered early, may indicate those students who might benefit from instruction aimed at alleviating anxiety.

References

Backlund, P. (1983). Methods of assessing speaking and listening skills. In R. B. Rubin (Ed.), Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 59-73). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L. (1984). Report of a panel on the preparation of beginning teachers. Princeton: Henry Chauncy Center.

Carroll, J. G. (1981). Faculty self-evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Foss, K. A. (1983). Overcoming communication anxiety. In R. B. Rubin (Ed.), Improving speaking and listening skills (pp. 25-35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hattie, J., Olphert, W., & Cole, B. (1982). Assessment of student teachers by supervising teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 778-785.

Kearney, P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension and teacher effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 4 (pp. 533-551). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

McCaleb, J. (1983, February). The predictive validity of two measures of teachers' communication ability. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Detroit.

McCaleb, J. (forthcoming). State certification requirements in speech communication.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Classroom consequences of communication apprehension. Communication Education, 26, 27-33.

McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 45, 192-203.

McCroskey, J. C., Andersen, J. F., Richmond, V. P., & Wheeless, L. R. (1981). Communication apprehension of elementary and secondary students and teachers. Communication Education, 30, 122-132.

McCroskey, J. C., Holdridge, W. E., & Toomb, J. K. (1974). An instrument for measuring the source credibility of basic speech communication instructors. Communication Education, 23, 26-33.

Natriello, G. & Dornbusch, S. M. (1980-81). Pitfalls in the evaluation of teachers by principals. Administrator's Notebook, 29 (6), 1-4.

Pottinger, P. S. (1979). Competence assessment: Comments on current practices. In P. S. Pottinger & J. Goldsmith (Eds.), Defining and measuring competence (pp. 25-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rubin, R. B. (1982a). Assessing speaking and listening competence at the college level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Communication Education, 31, 19-32.

Rubin, R. B. (1982b). Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Rubin, R. B. (1984, May). Validity and reliability of the Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, San Francisco.

Snyder, S. L. (1980, October). How well do prospective teachers speak? Paper presented at the meeting of the Pennsylvania Council of Teachers of English, Allentown.

Staton-Spicer, A. Q. (1983). The measurement and further conceptualization of teacher communication concern. Human Communication Research, 9, 158-168.

TABLE 1

PEARSON CORRELATIONS -- SKILL, KNOWLEDGE, MOTIVATION, AND TEACHING EVALUATION

	BCG	CCAI	SSS	GPA	PRCA	TEO
Average Speech Grade	1.00***	.22	.11	.38	-.15	.13
Basic Course Grade		.39*	.28	.32	-.31	.29
Comm. Comp. Assess. Inst.			.44***	.19	-.21	.19
Snyder Speech Scale				.12	-.21	.38***
Grade Point Average					.17	.10
Pers. Rpt. of Comm. App.						-.12
Teaching Evaluation Overall	.29	.19	.38**	.10	-.12	1.00
Decision-Making	.23	.13	.29*	.12	-.10	
Role of Instructor	.11	.01	.35**	.03	.01	
Interaction	.15	.31*	.48**	.04	-.10	
Scholar	.03	.18	.38**	.13	-.08	
Teacher Cred. Scale Total	.02	.26*	.38**	-.15	-.29*	.55***
Competence	-.10	.30*	.40**	-.17	-.21	.67***
Extroversion	.00	.17	.30*	-.26*	-.40**	.28*
Character	.19	.30*	.29*	.01	.00	.40**
Composure	-.01	.15	.18	.03	-.13	.40**
Sociability	.06	.24*	.42**	-.16	-.24	.56***

* p < .05 ** p < .01 ***p < .001